

## PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-C

### PC-C1

**From:** Cheryl Cameron [whitewings1947@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 8:03 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Cc:** cbyrne@octa.net  
**Subject:** the proposed above ground on/off ramp onto the 405 freeway

Re: the proposed above ground on/off ramp onto the 405 freeway at northbound Bushard and Warner Ave, Fountain Valley area.

Dear Sir/Madam

I live in the neighborhood bordering Bushard Street, Warner Ave, Magnolia and the 405 freeway. I have lived here on Pine Circle for about 16 years, my family consists of 2 adults who vote and pay taxes.

I strongly oppose this proposed ramp because of the increase in neighborhood traffic and the resulting noise and air pollution that will accompany it for all the surrounding neighborhoods.

When we first moved here the noise from the freeway was slight. As the years have gone on with an increase in lanes and traffic that noise has increased substantially as well as a decrease in air quality. It clearly affects the quality of our lives, we suffer noise and air pollution now, please do not consider raising that pollution with this ill-thought out proposal. We are more in need of you spending our tax dollars to build a more effective wall to buffer the noise and reroute the exhaust fumes this neighborhood experiences.

It is my opinion that any such freeway expansion will substantially lower the quality of our lives that we have in Fountain Valley.

Cheryl Cameron

### PC-C2

**From:** diana carey [DLCAREY2@VERIZON.NET]  
**Sent:** Thursday, August 01, 2013 10:18 AM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Cc:** Adolfo Ozaeta; Ernesto Munoz; mark.lewis@fountainvalley.org; Schelly Sustarsic; John Collins; Tri Ta; Sergio Contreras; Margie Rica; Sean Crumby; Michael Ho; Mike Levitt  
**Subject:** Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

The back up at the NB County line is of critical importance for the surrounding cities of Los Alamitos, Seal Beach, Long Beach, Rossmore and Westminster. We believe failure to address this issue will cause undue stresses on city streets, as was experienced during the recent closure of the 405/22 connector. Other than discussion points, the MTA has no plan to address this issue North of the County line. It is reckless and dangerous to deliberately create a situation that repeats the years of backlog on the NB I-5 at the County line. We are a self-help County. For Caltrans, an agency that does not have funding, to dictate any solution to us, based on less than 2% of low emission vehicles using the HOV lanes, is totally unacceptable.

Diana Carey  
Councilwoman, City of Westminster  
Corridor Cities Representative

### PC-C3

**From:** Henrietta Carter [henriettacarter1@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 24, 2013 1:46 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** No Toll Road!

It is already very difficult to cross several lanes of freeway to get past the 22 and 605 freeways to get over to the 405 from the northbound onramp that starts at Seal Beach Boulevard. Adding a toll plaza is only going to make matters worse. Please do not put a toll road on the 405 freeway at the 605! 1

Henrietta Carter  
2972 Tigertail Drive  
Los Alamitos, CA 90720

### PC-C4

**From:** Glen Cauble [drglenchiro@hotmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 4  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** 405 Supplemental report 1

Dear OCTA,

Thank you for all you hard work keeping our community moving.

In regards to the 405 Improvement project between Euclid and the 22:

Please, NO TOLL LANES!!! They are a double tax on the taxpayers of Orange County who paid to have the High Occupancy lanes put there years ago. That would be so unethical and wrong that I can't believe it was even proposed in the first place! 1

Build TWO GENERAL PURPOSE LANES IN EACH DIRECTION.

Let's get both lanes in each direction built NOW so we don't have to do this again in 10, 15 or 20 years from now. 2

Thanks again for your hard work.

Dr. Glen R. Cauble, DC  
Walk-In Chiropractic  
8586 Warner Avenue  
Fountain Valley, CA 92708  
714-841-4300 phone  
714-848-1226 fax  
[www.drglenchiro.com](http://www.drglenchiro.com)

PC-C5

**From:** Kim Clark [mailto:kcclark92626@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, August 09, 2013 11:35 AM  
**To:** Christina Byrne  
**Subject:** Re: Your Feedback Is Needed: 405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS

As I have said all along, I don't think this goes far enough. There is a lot of traffic between the 605 and Long Beach. If you really want to help relieve congestion, then work with LA County and get this done. I cannot reply to link you sent because it does not come up. I will not use the toll road on a regular basis. Also need easy access from north Costa Mesa to it so I can use it if I choose to. thanks.

1

PC-C6

**From:** Arnie Cliffgard [arnielol@aol.com]  
**Sent:** Sunday, August 11, 2013 3:38 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** 405 expansion project

I object to the new off ramp. It will cause an invasion of my privacy. It may cause land settling as did the Neeblas school project with a lot of plumbing problems.

Arnie  
9268 Daisy Avenue

1

PC-C7

**From:** Paul Cline [paulatlibertytax@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:46 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
**Subject:** Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents - Comment #1

I-405 Improvement Project

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than Monday, August 12, 2013.

Name: Paul Cline

Organization: N/A

Address: 3811 E. Livingston Dr. #103, Long Beach, CA 90803

Phone Number: 562-310-6937

Email: [15pta@sbceo.org](mailto:15pta@sbceo.org)

Comments:

Option 3 proposes to convert the existing HOV lane into HOT lanes where each vehicle is required to obtain and possess a FasTrak transponder device in order to legally be in the HOT lane.

In order for a driver to obtain a FasTrak device, the driver must sign off and agree to an indemnification clause. The indemnification clause basically states that the driver indemnifies the agency issuing the FasTrak device against any and all harm that might come from the possession of the device. Metro in Los Angeles has advised me that such harm might include "transponder flew through air when applied brakes and hit driver causing accident; transponder sparked/caught fire causing accident." Additional possibilities include catching fire due to extreme heat, transponder flying through air during accident and blinding passenger, birth defects caused by off-gassing from the plastic components of the FasTrak device, and lung damage caused by off-gassing of the plastic components of the FasTrak device due to car sitting in sun followed by driver entering and turning on AC with recirculation of air resulting in highly polluted ambient air.

PC-C7 Continued

PC-C8

Q1: Very specifically, what is the risk to the FasTrak issuing agency that justifies the inclusion of an "indemnification" clause in the contract that is signed by the driving public?

Q2: Which laws specifically allow for Caltrans to require the public to indemnify any agency in order to drive on a public highway? Please quote the actual wording in the law that specifically authorizes an indemnification clause.

Q3: With the signing of the indemnification clause by the end users, the FasTrak issuing agency is protected from lawsuit and thus has no reason to protect the public from the dangers presented by the FasTrak device (if the FasTrak device did not present a danger then there would be no need for an indemnification clause). What is Caltrans doing to protect the people of California from the risks associated with the FasTrak device? List specific actions taken, reports written, responses collected, tests conducted, specifications listed in contracts with vendors, etc.

Q4: With the signing of the indemnification clause by the end users, the FasTrak issuing agency is protected from lawsuit and thus has no reason to protect the public from the dangers presented by the FasTrak device (if the FasTrak device did not present a danger then there would be no need for an indemnification clause). What is OCTA doing to protect the people of California from the risks associated with the FasTrak device? List specific actions taken, reports written, responses collected, tests conducted, specifications listed in contracts with vendors, etc.

Q5: With the signing of the indemnification clause by the end users, the FasTrak issuing agency is protected from lawsuit and thus has no reason to protect the public from the dangers presented by the FasTrak device (if the FasTrak device did not present a danger then there would be no need for an indemnification clause). Please provide a list of each and every study of any kind that has examined/looked-at the risks to the public that are presented by the FasTrak device (and other similar devices).

Q6: With the signing of the indemnification clause by the end users, the FasTrak issuing agency is protected from lawsuit and thus has no reason to protect the public from the dangers presented by the FasTrak device (if the FasTrak device did not present a danger then there would be no need for an indemnification clause). Please provide copies of legal advice provided to transit agencies issuing FasTrak transponder devices concerning the risks the device presents to the agency if the agency were to not require an indemnification clause in its contracts.

From: Paul Cline [paulatlibertytax@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 9:46 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents - Comment #2

I-405 Improvement Project

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than Monday, August 12, 2013.

Name: Paul Cline

Organization: N/A

Address: 3811 E. Livingston Dr. #103, Long Beach, CA 90803

Phone Number: 562-310-6937

Email: [15pta@sbcco.org](mailto:15pta@sbcco.org)

Comments:

Option 3 proposes to convert the existing HOV lane into HOT lanes where each vehicle is required to obtain and possess a FasTrak transponder device in order to legally be in the HOT lane.

In Los Angeles County, Metro is currently running a demonstration project where existing HOV lanes on the 10 and the 110 freeways have been converted over to HOT lanes where each and every vehicle is required to have a FasTrak device in order to drive in the HOT lanes. For drivers meeting the carpool requirements, there is no fee charged for passage in the HOT lanes.

**PC-C8 Continued**

In San Diego County, SANDAG has set up Toll Lanes for solo drivers to be able to use the excess capacity of the HOV lanes along a stretch of I-15. In the San Diego design, carpool drivers are not required to possess a FasTrak transponder device in their vehicle.

Q1: Please explain how it came to be that Option 3 specifies that all drivers will be required to possess a FasTrak device as opposed to the San Diego model where only solo drivers are required to possess a FasTrak device?

Q2: Please explain how the model where every driver is required to possess a FasTrak device is superior to the model in San Diego where only solo drivers are required to possess a FasTrak device.

Q3:

1

**PC- C9**

**From:** Paul Cline [paulatl libertytax@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 9:46 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Subject:** Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents - Comment #3

I-405 Improvement Project

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than Monday, August 12, 2013.

Name: Paul Cline

Organization: N/A

Address: 3811 E. Livingston Dr. #103, Long Beach, CA 90803

Phone Number: 562-310-6937

Email: [15pta@sbceo.org](mailto:15pta@sbceo.org)

Comments:

Option 3 proposes to convert the existing HOV lane into HOT lanes where each vehicle is required to obtain and possess a FasTrak transponder device in order to legally be in the HOT lane.

In Los Angeles County, Metro is currently running a demonstration project where existing HOV lanes on the 10 and the 110 freeways have been converted over to HOT lanes where each and every vehicle is required to have a FasTrak device in order to drive in the HOT lanes. For drivers meeting the carpool requirements, there is no fee charged for passage in the HOT lanes.

PC-9 Continued

In San Diego County, SANDAG has set up Toll Lanes for solo drivers to be able to use the excess capacity of the HOV lanes along a stretch of I-15. In the San Diego design, carpool drivers are not required to possess a FasTrak transponder device in their vehicle.

Q1: Please detail how much money is to be raised annually by collection of the tolls specifying numbers of vehicles, tolls collected, fines collected plus any other relevant information typically considered or utilized.

Q2: Please detail how much money will be spent to operate the FasTrak system.

Q3: Please explain how the HOT lane option DOES NOT promote solo drivers.

Q4: Using the amount of money raised by toll paying drivers in the HOT lanes, please detail what traffic improving measures these monies will pay for. If traffic improvements include additional bus traffic/routes, please include the typical costs for such service (such as: a typical bus route of the type envisioned cost \$XXX) so that the public can see how much service the toll money can buy. In providing projection numbers, please also provide a range of values from "optimistic" to "conservative" as experts always make projections with large amounts of subjectiveness.

PC-10

From: Paul Cline (paulatlibertytax@gmail.com)  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 9:46 PM  
To: Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents - Comment #4

I-405 Improvement Project

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than Monday, August 12, 2013.

Name: Paul Cline

Organization: N/A

Address: 3811 E. Livingston Dr. #103, Long Beach, CA 90803

Phone Number: 562-310-6937

Email: [15pta@sbceo.org](mailto:15pta@sbceo.org)

Comments:

Option 3 proposes to convert the existing HOV lane into HOT lanes where each vehicle is required to obtain and possess a FasTrak transponder device in order to legally be in the HOT lane.

In Los Angeles County, Metro is currently running a demonstration project where existing HOV lanes on the 10 and the 110 freeways have been converted over to HOT lanes where each and every vehicle is required to have a FasTrak device in order to drive in the HOT lanes. For drivers meeting the carpool requirements, there is no fee charged for passage in the HOT lanes.



PC-C10 Continued

In San Diego County, SANDAG has set up Toll Lanes for solo drivers to be able to use the excess capacity of the HOV lanes along a stretch of I-15. In the San Diego design, carpool drivers are not required to possess a FasTrak transponder device in their vehicle.

In Metro's February 2013 report on the Express Lanes, they report that 30% of the HOV lane drivers are driving in the HOT lanes. Stated another way, 70% of the HOV lane drivers that existed before the conversion to HOT lanes are gone (in other words "kicked out"). In Metro's July 2013 report on the Express Lanes, they report that a graph of the economic classes of the HOT lane drivers shows a "bell curve" which also means that a large number of poor people in LA County have been kicked out of the HOT lanes because the population of LA County is not a bell curve where the numbers of poor people is comparable to the numbers of rich people but is in fact a situation where the number of poor people greatly exceeds the number of rich people.

Q1: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who carpool and currently qualify to drive in the HOV lanes without any additional burden beyond having two or more people in their vehicle.

Q2: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who do not have a credit card.

Q3: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who do not have an email address.

Q4: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who do not have an internet connection.

Q5: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who do not have a computer.

Q6: Please explain how the proposed Express Lanes / HOT model proposed in option 3 does not place an undue burden on the poor and the elderly who have more than one vehicle but only qualify for one transponder at an "equity" rate.

Q7: If the answers above are similar to the practices of Metro for their Express Lanes, please explain why the OC plan will work where the Metro plan has not.

PC-C11

From: Paul Cline [paulatlibertytax@gmail.com]  
Sent: Monday, August 12, 2013 9:46 PM  
To: Parsons, 405.Supplemental.Draft.EIR.EIS  
Subject: Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents - Comment #5

I-405 Improvement Project

Comment Sheet

Please provide your comments regarding the I-405 Improvement Project Supplemental Draft Environmental Impact Report / Environmental Impact Statement (EIR/EIS)

Comments must be received by Caltrans no later than Monday, August 12, 2013.

Name: Paul Cline

Organization: N/A

Address: 3811 E. Livingston Dr. #103, Long Beach, CA 90803

Phone Number: 562-310-6937

Email: [15pta@sbceo.org](mailto:15pta@sbceo.org)

Comments:

Option 3 proposes to convert the existing HOV lane into HOT lanes where each vehicle is required to obtain and possess a FasTrak transponder device in order to legally be in the HOT lane.

Q1: In the development of the various options presented to the public in the EIR, Option 3 with the HOT lanes came into existence. Please provide a detailed accounting of the history of option 3 and the HOT lanes including the names and organizations that added the HOT lane idea into the mix of options; the names and organizations that promoted the HOT lanes idea from inception to a spot on the EIR; and any other background information that will help the public to understand who is promoting the creation of HOT lanes that require all carpool drivers to obtain a FasTrak device in order to drive in the carpool/express lanes.

PC-C12

**From:** Manley Cohen [manleycohen@gmail.com] on behalf of Manley Cohen [manleycohen@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Friday, July 19, 2013 4:58 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Subject:** 405 Freeway. Make no toll roads

2 GP lanes preferred in both directions. but NO TOLL ROADS. } 1

PC-C13

**From:** Mark Cole [MarkC@cardintegrators.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:00 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Cc:** Teri Cole  
**Subject:** RE: Comments on HOV / HOT Lanes

Smita Deshpande, Branch Chief  
Caltrans District 12  
Attn: 405 DEIR-DEIS Comment Period  
2201 Dupont Dr. Suite 200  
Irvine, CA 92612

As a long time resident of Rossmoor, I am concerned that auto traffic lane expansion on the Northbound 405, without adequate traffic mitigation of the increased capacity as this traffic enters Los Angeles County, will create bottlenecks with increased slowdowns, delays and substantially higher auto emissions.

I am in favor of creating the lanes for efficient transition to the inevitable expansion that will occur along the initial portion of the 405 that exists in Long Beach / LA County. } 1

This being said, I am strongly against having up to three or four additional lanes added to the northbound 405 as it leaves Orange County, without appropriate transition lanes in place in Los Angeles County.

Mark Cole

**CI Solutions**  
Imagine More >  
**Card Integrators Corporation**  
Tel (800) 599-7385 Extension 511  
Fax (562) 493-2714  
[www.cisolutions.biz](http://www.cisolutions.biz)

State of California Certified Small Business - # 28073  
California Multiple Awards Schedule - #3-09-87-0016A  
US General Services Administration GSA #GS-02F-0147V

Think green  
Please consider the environment before printing this e-mail. Thank you.

PC-C14

**From:** Jane Conover [decababes@verizon.net]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 12:10 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Subject:** 16340 Timothy Lane, Westminster

Hello,

My name is Thomas Conover I live next to the proposed 405 project. In speaking to caltrans representatives we have been told our property is not going to be affected, but in reading the impact report there is reference to on/off ramp connections between Beach Blvd and Magnolia. That is where I live. We are holding off on any home improvements until we are sure we will not be affected. } 1

PC-C15

**From:** Dave Corp [davelinda87@gmail.com]  
**Sent:** Wednesday, July 17, 2013 3:32 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Subject:** Re: I-405 Supplemental Documents

It is absurd to be considering HOT lanes on the 405 freeway again!! People, you are wasting the taxpayer's money!! The project is NOT wanted!! } 1

David Corp

PC-C16

**From:** David Cota [dcota@yamaha.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, July 15, 2013 3:50 PM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS  
**Subject:** Toll Lanes

My neighborhood has been in shambles for years to build the connectors for the carpool lanes and now you wish to charge us to use it? Are you kidding? Widen the freeway all you want, but toll roads do not help the general public, only those who have the means to use them. } 1

PC-C17

**From:** Melissa Cunningham [shrkluvr76@yahoo.com]  
**Sent:** Monday, August 12, 2013 11:48 AM  
**To:** Parsons, 405 Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS

I vote NO on the TOLL Roads. I vote for Alternative 1 - ONE more normal lane on both sides on the I405. The fwy is big enough } 1

## **RESPONSE TO PUBLIC COMMENTS (PC)-C**

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C1**

#### **Comment PC-C1-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Noise, Air, Northbound Braided Ramps.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C2**

#### **Comment PC-C2-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C3**

#### **Comment PC-C3-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C4**

#### **Comment PC-C4-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis



presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

**Comment PC-C4-2**

Please see Common Response – Preferred Alternative Identification.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-C5**

**Comment PC-C5-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, Gateway City Council of Governments, and the City of Long Beach, Opposition to Tolling, Replacement of Fairview Road Overcrossing/Truncation of Tolloed Express Lanes.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-C6**

**Comment PC-C6-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps.

**Response to Comment Letter PC-C7**

**Comment PC-C7-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in

your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. See Response to Comment PC-C8.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C8**

#### **Comment PC-C8-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. The Draft EIR/EIS states on page 2-18: “The policies under which the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 would be operated have not been finalized. The policies presented here provide the current plans to operate the Express Lanes. Final decisions on operating policies would be made during final design and prior to opening of the project if Alternative 3 is identified as the alternative to be constructed.” The operating policies included in the Draft EIR/EIS were based on operation of the facility by OCTA with policies similar to those currently used by OCTA on SR-91. If Alternative 3 is the Preferred Alternative, more detailed consideration of operating policies would be undertaken. This would include consideration of the requirement for motorists using the Express Lanes to obtain a transponder.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C9**

#### **Comment PC-C9-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. A Phase II Traffic and Revenue Study was prepared to assess the financial feasibility of the Express Lane component of Alternative 3 and is summarized in documents available on the OCTA Web site. The Traffic and Revenue Study is not part of the Draft EIR/EIS. A complete and detailed financial plan that itemizes the costs of each component of the operations (e.g., the cost of operating the FasTrak system if that system is selected for use on the facility) was not prepared for the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 as part of the development of the information included in the Draft EIR/EIS.

The objective is to open the tolled Express Lanes with a HOV2+ occupancy free to encourage rideshare and transit usage. Operational adjustments to the tolled Express Lanes may be implemented based on demand, rates of speed, traffic volumes, and to meet financial covenants,

maintenance and operational obligations. Potential operational adjustments include, but are not limited to:

- adjusting to HOV3+ free with HOV2s discounted tolls
- adjusting to HOV3+ free with HOV2s full tolls
- adjusting to tolling HOV2s on individual tolling segments such as direct connectors to or from other freeways
- periodic adjustments of tolling rates to maintain operations on individual tolling segments

No estimate of potential toll revenue in excess of what is needed to construct and operate the Express Lanes in Alternative 3 was included in the Draft EIR/EIS. Under federal law, any excess revenue must be spent on transportation improvements within the corridor. No projects that depend on excess toll revenue have been identified in the Draft EIR/EIS.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C10**

#### **Comment PC-C10-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

For an explanation of the reason why the Express Lane occupancy requirement for free passage would be raised from two-person carpools to three-person carpools, see Appendix R1 Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

As noted in Response to Comment PC-C8-1, the operating policies for the Express Lanes have not been finalized. Based on the SR-91 model, a variety of payment means and methods would be available to accommodate the diverse population anticipated to choose to use the Express Lanes.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C11**

#### **Comment PC-C11-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS. You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review. The Express Lane concept was developed by OCTA in response to reductions of Measure M Extension sales tax resulting from

the economic downturn and the desire to consider an alternative that would serve more traffic through more active traffic management.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C12**

#### **Comment PC-C12-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Preferred Alternative Identification, Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C13**

#### **Comment PC-C13-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Traffic Flow at the Orange County/Los Angeles County Line, Coordination between Caltrans Districts 7 and 12, OCTA, Los Angeles Metro, Gateway City Council of Governments, and the City of Long Beach.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C14**

#### **Comment PC-C14-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Northbound Braided Ramps.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C15**

#### **Comment PC-C15-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C16**

#### **Comment PC-C16-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Response – Opposition to Tolling.

### **Response to Comment Letter PC-C17**

#### **Comment PC-C17-1**

Caltrans and OCTA thank you for participating in the environmental process for the I-405 Improvement Project. Your comment is not specific to the new information and analysis presented within the Supplemental Draft EIR/EIS; however, your comments were addressed in Appendix R1 (Response to Comments on Draft EIR/EIS). You will be notified at the address provided in your comment when the Final EIR/EIS is available for review.

Please see Common Responses – Opposition to Tolling, Preferred Alternative Identification.